

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/898,527

Applicant(s)

WALL ET AL.

Examiner

J. Derek Rutten

Art Unit

2192

All Participants:(1) J. Derek Rutten(2) Mary Lou Wakimura, Reg. No. 31,804**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 21 June 2006**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112

Claims discussed:

1, 2

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patents 7039920, 7043736, 7062771

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 6/20/06, the Examiner suggested that the claims appear to have allowable subject matter, but double patenting issues exist. Ms. Wakimura suggested filing terminal disclaimers to overcome double patenting issues. The examiner agreed that a proper terminal disclaimer would overcome double patenting issues. Ms. Wakimura agreed to fax a new terminal disclaimer to USPTO Central Fax as well as to the Examiner's personal fax number for immediate inspection. On 6/21/06, the examiner contacted Ms. Wakimura to discuss potential 112 issues with claim 2. Agreement was made to amend claim 1 in order to clarify the claims..